

We are nowhere near prepared to deal with that influx.

Again, a third Democratic Senator on the subject of ending title 42.

Mr. President, under the Biden administration, we have had 12 straight months of border encounters in excess of over 150,000. In February, U.S. Customs and Border Protection encountered 164,973 individuals attempting to cross our southern border illegally—the highest February number in more than 20 years. And, of course, those numbers only reflect individuals the Border Patrol has succeeded in apprehending. There is no question that many other illegal immigrants have crossed the border in the past year without being apprehended and have disappeared into the United States. The President is largely responsible for this situation thanks to the series of actions he has taken to weaken border security and immigration enforcement since his administration began.

Mr. President, illegal immigration is a very serious problem for several reasons. First of all, it is dangerous for any country not to know who is entering the country, who is crossing its borders. Illegal border crossings are not confined to individuals wanting to build a better life for themselves. Weak borders are an invitation to human traffickers, drug smugglers, gangs, and even terrorists.

We currently have a very serious fentanyl problem in this country. In fact, fentanyl overdose is the leading cause of death for U.S. adults between the ages of 18 and 45. And where is this fentanyl coming from? It is being trafficked across our southern border. In fact, Mexico has replaced China as the dominant source of fentanyl in the United States. There is no question that the worse the situation at the border gets, the easier it is for drug smugglers to evade detection and capture.

Our Border Patrol officers do heroic work, but they are stretched incredibly thin and have been for the past year. It is simply common sense to acknowledge that the greater the flood of illegal immigration they have to contend with, the easier it is going to be for bad actors to get across the border.

So there are real security concerns that illegal immigration represents. There are also serious humanitarian concerns. The journey to our southern border for those attempting to cross illegally is frequently fraught with danger, and there is nothing compassionate about encouraging individuals to undertake that journey, to run the risk of exploitation and disease and exposure.

Finally, encouraging or tacitly endorsing illegal immigration shows a real disregard for the rule of law. I am a strong supporter of legal immigration. I am one generation removed from immigrants in this country, and I hope this country will always serve as a refuge for individuals seeking a new life for peace and for freedom. But immigration laws are not exceptions to

the principle that the law must be respected.

We can and should make changes to immigration laws as needed to address problems or to expand opportunities, but immigration must proceed according to the law. To suggest otherwise is to cultivate contempt for the rule of law, not to mention how unfair it is to those who have done what is required to come here legally.

As President, President Biden has a particular responsibility to care for the country's security. When it comes to the border, at least, he is failing in that responsibility, and he is betraying the duty he owes to the American people, who should be able to count on their President to care about security concerns, including border security.

We are less than 2 months away from the end of title 42 restrictions and the border surge that we expect to follow. I hope that the President will use that time to get serious about developing a plan to secure our southern border because he owes the American people nothing less.

I yield the floor.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator from Texas.

NOMINATION OF KETANJI BROWN JACKSON

Mr. CRUZ. Mr. President, I rise today ahead of the Senate's vote on Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to be a Justice on the U.S. Supreme Court. There are few responsibilities the Senate has that are more important than confirming judges and, in particular, confirming Justices on the Supreme Court of the United States.

The Supreme Court is charged with the responsibility of defending and upholding the Constitution and the Bill of Rights. It is charged with the responsibility of upholding the rule of law and protecting your rights and my rights.

Judge Jackson is someone that I have known personally for 30 years. She and I went to law school together. We were both on the law review together. Judge Jackson is someone who, on a personal level—she is smart; she is talented; she is charming. I have always liked Judge Jackson. But the responsibility given to the Senate is not to make an assessment on a personal level, but rather to assess a nominee's record and the kind of job they would do for the position to which they have been appointed.

Now, many Democrats in this Chamber and their cheerleaders in the corporate media insist that we cannot examine Judge Jackson's record. They insist, in fact, that any scrutiny of her record, any difficult questions directed to her nomination must, must, must be rooted in racism or sexism. Sadly, this is a common talking point for Democrats. Whenever anyone disagrees with them on substance, you must be a racist. If you are not a socialist, you are a racist. That is their standard go-to.

And in this instance, all should acknowledge and should celebrate the

historic milestone that would be having the first African-American woman serve as a Justice on the Supreme Court. Given our Nation's troubled history on race, that is a major important milestone. I would note, though, that the Democrats celebrating that fact—patting themselves on the back—there is more than a little irony in their celebrating that fact because the reason that we have not, to date, had an African-American woman on the Supreme Court—a major reason—is that the Democrats who are so proud of themselves filibustered a qualified African-American woman nominated to the U.S. Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit. Her name was Janice Rogers Brown. She was a justice on the California Supreme Court, and 20 years ago, President George W. Bush, a Republican, nominated her to the DC Circuit. And Senate Democrats realized that a qualified African-American woman on the DC Circuit was a real threat to go to the U.S. Supreme Court.

Janice Rogers Brown is a conservative and a constitutionalist, and for Democrats, that was unacceptable. So Democrats filibustered Janice Rogers Brown. CHUCK SCHUMER filibustered Janice Rogers Brown. Joe Biden filibustered Janice Rogers Brown. DICK DURBIN filibustered Janice Rogers Brown. PAT LEAHY filibustered Janice Rogers Brown. DIANNE FEINSTEIN filibustered Janice Rogers Brown.

So now, all the Democrats who are celebrating putting the first African-American woman on the Supreme Court have themselves to thank for that because it could have happened 20 years ago.

But in Senate Democrats' way of viewing things, if a Black woman or a Black man or a Hispanic woman or a Hispanic man dared to disagree with leftist orthodoxy, they do not count. Indeed, it was not just Janice Rogers Brown. Democrats also filibustered Miguel Estrada to the DC Circuit. Miguel Estrada, an advocate with superb credentials, was criticized, as the staff for Senator Ted Kennedy wrote at the time in internal memos that they could filibuster "because he is Hispanic."

Mr. President, this was before your time and my time in this body.

Here is what Ted Kennedy's staff told them:

Identify [Miguel Estrada] as especially dangerous . . . because he is Latino.

That is racism—which the Democrats put in writing. If you are Black, if you are Hispanic, we will target you, we will filibuster you, we will block you, and that is what they did. For that matter, that is what Democrats have done for three decades now to Justice Clarence Thomas, one of the greatest Justices to ever serve on the U.S. Supreme Court. And yet, in Democrats' minds, he is not a Black man because he dares disagree with their leftist ideology. It is wrong; it is racist; it is cynical; and it is offensive.

What we should be doing—what every Senator should be doing—is examining Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson's record, her actual record. If you look at her substantive record, it is far out of the mainstream. It is an extreme record. If you look at her record, I believe it demonstrates that Judge Jackson, if she is confirmed, will be the single most liberal Supreme Court Justice ever to serve on the Supreme Court. I believe she will be to the left of Justice Sotomayor; she will be to the left of Justice Kagan; and she will be way, way, way to the left of Justice Stephen Breyer, the Justice she would be replacing.

What does that mean as a practical matter, left and right? Why do the American people care about the Supreme Court? They care because they care about their rights. As a practical matter, what it means—I believe the odds are nearly 100 percent that Judge Jackson would vote to overturn the case of *Heller v. District of Columbia*.

What is that case? It is the landmark case that upholds the Second Amendment right to keep and bear arms, a fundamental protection for all of us. That case was decided 5 to 4. Judge Jackson, I believe, is a vote to overturn that case to take away our Second Amendment rights, and that means every Senator who votes to confirm her is voting to take away the Second Amendment rights of Americans.

Judge Jackson, I believe the odds are nearly 100 percent that she would vote to overturn the *Citizens United* case. What is *Citizens United*? It is a landmark case that protects our right to free speech, our right to speak in the political process to support candidates, to oppose candidates, to express our views, and participate in democracy. *Citizens United* was 5 to 4, one vote away from being taken away.

By the way, in the *Citizens United* case, the Obama Justice Department argued that the Federal Government has the power to ban books. The case was 5 to 4. There were four Justices willing to go there. Judge Jackson, I believe, would support the assertions of government power to silence you, to silence me, to silence the men and women we represent.

When it comes to religious liberty, I believe Judge Jackson will vote consistently over and over again against the religious liberty of Americans, against our right to live according to our faith, according to our conscience. One of the most precious rights, the very first right protected in the first clause of the First Amendment of the Bill of Rights—that is what our Framers thought about it—is that without the right to seek out and worship the Lord God Almighty with all of your heart, mind, and soul, no other rights matter. I believe she will consistently vote to undermine that right and, in particular, one of the applications of that right, the context of school choice.

School choice is the civil rights issue of the 21st century. If you care about

civil rights, if you care about advancement and opportunity for young kids, for young African-American kids, for young Hispanic kids, there is nothing, nothing, nothing that matters more than school choice. And yet, the Supreme Court, in the case of *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris*, upheld Ohio school choice program by one vote, 5 to 4. I believe Judge Jackson would vote to overturn *Zelman v. Simmons-Harris* and vote to strike down school choice programs across the country.

You know, one of the problems with politics today is Members of this body like to avoid accountability for what they are doing. But everyone in this body is on notice that this is a Justice who will vote to take away our free speech rights, vote to take away our religious liberty rights, vote to take away our Second Amendment. And that means every Senator that votes for her cannot avoid responsibility for those lawless outcomes.

When it comes to abortion, Judge Jackson's record is extreme. I believe she would vote to strike down every single restriction across the country on abortion. I believe she would vote to strike down prohibitions on Federal partial-birth abortion, a truly horrific practice opposed by the vast majority of Americans. The Supreme Court upheld the Federal ban on partial-birth abortion by a vote of 5 to 4—one vote away. Judge Jackson, based on her record of being a radical advocate for abortion, will consistently vote to strike down reasonable restrictions.

All of those are extreme positions. But if you want to understand just how extreme, there was one portion of the confirmation hearing that I thought spoke volumes: when Senator Marcia Blackburn asked Judge Jackson, "What is a woman?"

"What is a woman?" didn't used to be a trick question. One hundred fifteen men and women have served on the Supreme Court, and all 115 of them would have no difficulty whatsoever answering the question, "What is a woman?"—not so Judge Jackson. Judge Jackson's response: I can't define a woman.

"I am not a biologist" was her defense.

Now, does that really mean that Judge Jackson doesn't know what a woman is? Of course not. What it does show is her sensibility that she is completely in line with the radical left that wants to redefine what a woman is and erase it from the dictionary. You know, yesterday, a reporter stopped me. A reporter from a left-leaning publication said he was asking every Senate Republican on the Judiciary Committee the following question: What is a woman?

You could tell from the expression on his face he thought this was a great "gotcha" question.

I looked at him and said: An adult female human.

He looked at me astonished, and he said: Did you look it up? He said, That is actually the dictionary definition.

I said, No. I just speak English. If you would like another definition, how about this one: A *Homo sapien* with two X chromosomes. For all of recorded history, people have known what a woman is, but Judge Jackson is such a fellow traveler with the radical left that she cannot acknowledge common sense.

There is a reason the radical left groups in this country pressured the Biden White House to nominate Judge Jackson because she was the most extreme of the nominees being considered. There is a reason they pledged billions of dollars to support her confirmation because she is the most extreme of the nominees being considered.

Let me give an example of just how extreme. In the written questions, I submitted a question to Judge Jackson that says:

The theory that humans possess inherent or inalienable rights is reflected in the Declaration of Independence, which states:

We hold these truths to be self-evident, that all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are life, liberty, and the pursuit of happiness.

Do you hold a position on whether individuals possess natural rights, yes or no?

Judge Jackson answered—this is in writing:

I do not hold a position on whether individuals possess natural rights.

That is a radical broad statement. Our country was founded on the quote I just read from the Declaration of Independence, with those words that Thomas Jefferson penned.

We declared our independence from Great Britain. We declared that we were our own Nation. We started a revolutionary war. We drafted a Constitution based on the proposition "We hold these truths to be self-evident." They are not evident to Judge Jackson.

She doesn't hold a position that "all men are created equal, that they are endowed by their Creator with certain unalienable rights, that among these are Life, Liberty, and the pursuit of Happiness." Judge Jackson says she has no position on whether you have a right to life. She has no position over whether you have a right to liberty. She has no position on whether you have a right to the pursuit of happiness.

If you are a modern leftist, if you are a socialist who wants the government to control every aspect of your life, every aspect of your freedom, then a judge who has no view on whether we have natural rights is exactly the kind of judge you want.

By the way, to understand how radical her opinion is, you can look at the *Make the Road* decision. This is a decision in her court, in the district court, that was challenging the Trump Department of Homeland Security deporting people illegally in this country.

The statute under which the Secretary was removing illegal aliens explicitly gave the Secretary discretion

and said that discretion is unreviewable in Federal courts. It was a clear and explicit authorization and a removal of the authority of Federal courts to second-guess the policy determinations. That didn't stop Judge Jackson at all. She ignored the plain text of the statute. She issued a nationwide injunction to stop the Federal Government from removing illegal aliens. Her decision was so extreme that, on appeal, it was reversed by the Federal Court of Appeals for the DC Circuit unanimously. This is a left-leaning court, with a majority of Democrat appointments, and unanimously, the DC Circuit reversed her because she ignored the plain language of the statute.

But there is no area that is more extreme than Judge Jackson's record on crime. This was the central focus of the confirmation hearing, and her record is far, far, far out of step with the mainstream.

When it comes to crime generally, nationally, the average for Federal judges sentencing criminals is 45.1 months. That is the average sentence nationally. Judge Jackson's average is 29.9 months—33.8 percent less than the national average. If you are a criminal, you want to be in Judge Jackson's court because you are going to get a sentence more than a third less than you will get in the average district court. That is far out of the mainstream.

As you know, there was considerable focus not just on her leniency on criminals, her leniency on violent criminals, her leniency on sexual predators, her leniency on drug dealers, but there was a particular focus on her very disturbing record as it concerns child pornography.

When it comes to child sex offenders, it is a truly grotesque problem we face in this country. I spent a number of years in law enforcement. As the solicitor general of Texas, I worked on many criminal cases. There were no cases that were more disturbing to me personally than the cases where people abused kids, where they hurt kids, the evil, sick predators who carry out unspeakable acts on little children.

I have to say, when I first heard that there was a concern about her record on child pornography, I thought, come on now, that can't possibly be the case. Who is soft on child pornography? That didn't sound plausible. Then I examined her actual record. I examined cases. She had roughly a dozen child pornography cases as a district judge. In every single case where she had discretion, 100 percent of the time where she had discretion, she sentenced the defendant way, way, way below the Federal sentencing guidelines and way, way, way below what the prosecutors recommended, the very liberal DC prosecutors.

Now, when this issue was first raised, the Democrats responded: Well, Federal judges across the country sentence defendants below the sentencing guide-

lines, especially concerning child pornography. And that claim, insofar as it goes, is true. But her record is not simply sentencing below the guidelines; it is sentencing way, way, way below prosecutors.

Then we examined, how does she sentence in child pornography cases compared to other Federal judges? Let's compare apples to apples. When it comes to possession of child pornography, the national average for all Federal judges is 68 months, a little over 5 years. It is a serious crime with a serious prison sentence. Judge Jackson's average is 29.2 months. Now, note, the national average sentences child porn offenders to a longer sentence than your typical crime. Judge Jackson sentences child porn defendants to a shorter sentence than your typical crime. When it concerns possession of child pornography, it is a 57-percent difference.

But it is even more disturbing in a separate category, and that is distribution of child pornography. Distribution of child pornography, the national average is 135 months—11 years—a long time for a horrific crime. Judge Jackson's average sentence was 71.9 months. That is a full 47 percent less than the national average.

But it is even more egregious than that when you understand that with distribution of child pornography, Congress has passed into law a minimum sentence of 60 months. So Federal judges have no discretion to sentence below 60 months. That is the bare minimum. When you look at that, you realize that judges across the country—and we are not talking just Republican judges; we are talking Democrat judges: Bill Clinton judges, Barack Obama judges, Joe Biden judges—they sentence, on average, 75 months longer than the minimum. Judge Jackson sentences on average 11.9 months longer. It is a consistent and disturbing pattern.

Now, why does she do this? Well, when you sit down and read the transcripts of her sentencing hearings, which I have done, it is disturbing stuff. When you read the transcripts, she is very explicit that she has clear policy concerns.

Under the sentencing guidelines, there is a stricter sentence for child pornography involving very young children. She refuses to apply that. There is a sentencing enhancement for child pornography involving sadomasochistic abuse of children, children being tortured. She refuses to apply that.

If you look at what she has said, she said to the prosecutors—this is a quote from Judge Jackson at a sentencing hearing in *United States v. Cane*—she said, “[You are] obviously aware”—she is talking to the prosecutors—“[You are] obviously aware of my policy disagreement. I just think it's very, very hard to deal with number of images as a significant aggravator.”

Now, what does this mean? There are two other aggravators for child pornog-

raphy. One is use of a computer, and the other is number of images. In case after case, she refuses to apply them.

On use of a computer, she says: Well, at the time the guidelines were passed, this crime was primarily carried out through the mail. Now, everybody does it through a computer, so I am not going to use an enhancement for a computer.

Now, I don't agree with her on that, but I understand that point. That point is not out of the mainstream. But there is another aggravator, an aggravator up to five levels for the number of images, and over and over again, she says she won't apply the number of images.

I asked at her hearing. I said: So you are saying that somebody who has videos of a thousand children being sexually abused and somebody who has an image of one child being abused—that those are the same crimes, that you shouldn't punish the one offender more than the other?

She refused to answer that question.

That is extreme. It is radical, and that is not the law. Her disagreement—I would note, I believe I have 25 minutes, and Senator THUNE extended—had a UC to change the time.

The ACTING PRESIDENT pro tempore. The Senator has used the 25 minutes allotted.

Mr. CRUZ. When it comes to Judge Jackson's record, it is far out of the mainstream. This is a judge who, as a Justice—the odds are 100 percent, I believe, she will vote to strike down the death penalty nationwide, and she will rule repeatedly to release violent criminals, to release murderers, to release sex offenders. This is a pattern that is highly, highly disturbing.

Our Democratic colleagues like to say they don't support abolishing the police. When you nominate and confirm judges who let criminals out of jail, you have the responsibility for the consequences of your actions.

Judge Jackson's record is extreme, and I urge my colleagues to vote against her confirmation.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Ms. DUCKWORTH). The Senator from Michigan.

Ms. STABENOW. Madam President, first let me say, after listening to my colleague from Texas, if half of what he said I thought was accurate, I would not be supporting Judge Jackson. Fortunately, it is not. So I rise today to urge the Senate to confirm Judge Ketanji Brown Jackson to the United States Supreme Court. I am so excited about her nomination.

Her nomination, we know, is historic—not just because Judge Jackson is eminently qualified for the position. Both Democrats and Republicans agree. In fact, based on her broad range of experience, you could argue she is more qualified to serve on the Supreme Court than any sitting judge. It is not just historic because of the dignified and honorable way she has conducted herself during this entire nomination process. If you think your last job

interview was rough, take a look at hers. Judge Jackson showed incredible grace during more than 20 hours of questioning that at times was incredibly hostile and rude. I would challenge any Member of this Chamber to endure that level of pressure without cracking. I am quite certain I couldn't do it. She is eminently qualified, and we have seen her judicial temperament up close.

What really makes Judge Jackson's nomination historic is this number: 115. One hundred and fifteen. That is how many U.S. Supreme Court Justices have served in our Nation's entire history—115. Out of those 115 Justices, 108 have been White males. Just think about it for a moment. In other words, nearly 94 percent of the Supreme Court Justices in our Nation's history have been White men. That is a very exclusive club.

And like many very exclusive clubs, it has tended to leave a lot of folks out in the cold. In a country as magnificently diverse as ours, that is simply not right, and I am so grateful that President Biden understands this.

The decisions made by the U.S. Supreme Court touch every single American. What does the right to vote truly mean under our Constitution? Freedom of religion; our freedom of speech. How are we as consumers or workers treated under our Constitution? Can a public school district force White students to attend one school while sending Black students to another? Can that same public school district refuse to educate students with disabilities? Can a couple be prevented from marrying and spending the rest of their lives caring for one another because they happen to be gay? And can a State override a woman's right to privacy and force her to continue a pregnancy that puts her own health and future at risk?

These are some of the types of decisions made by the U.S. Supreme Court every day. And when the Supreme Court doesn't look like America, it means that its decisions are less likely to take into account the lives and the needs of all Americans.

The late Justice Ruth Bader Ginsburg had a straightforward answer when she was asked how many women should serve on the U.S. Supreme Court. How many was enough? "Nine," she would say.

Well, we are not quite there yet—but four? I would say that is a pretty good start. And a Black woman Justice? It is about time. It is past time.

You may have seen a wonderful photo making the rounds. It is of Judge Jackson's 17-year-old daughter Leila. It was from the first day of the nomination hearing. Leila is wearing a beautiful lavender suit and sitting behind her mom.

The expression on her face is absolutely priceless. She is looking at her mom with such admiration and pride.

Well, Leila isn't alone. Millions of young Black girls and their moms and their grandmas are looking at Judge

Jackson with that same pride and admiration. They have never had someone who looks like them serving on our Nation's highest Court.

And how many of these young girls will see this incredibly accomplished woman and think, "Hey, that could be me"? I hope they all do.

I will be honored to support Judge Jackson's confirmation. I am excited. I am proud of her. And I urge my colleagues to do the same. It is past time.

I yield the floor.

NOMINATION OF JAMES C. O'BRIEN

Mr. MENENDEZ. Mr. President, I rise today to express my support for the nomination of James O'Brien to be Coordinator of Sanctions Policy at the U.S. Department of State.

At a time when we must keep the pressure on Putin to end his unprovoked, brutal, and illegal war against Ukraine, we need experienced officials at the helm to ensure that we are using every sanctions tool against Russia. As the power of our sanctions has been amplified by working closely with our allies and partners around the world, the long-term success of those efforts will be greatly enhanced by having a Senate-confirmed official in place to ensure that those coordination efforts continue and that we maximize the costs on Russia's economy.

Mr. O'Brien is exactly the type of leader that the Office of Sanctions Coordination needs. And he brings impressive substantive expertise and professional background to this role.

Mr. O'Brien is a former career employee of the State Department and recipient of numerous performance awards. He has served two U.S. administrations as a special envoy, for Hostage Affairs, and for the Balkans. Over the course of his career at the State Department, he has led a large and successful sanctions program and advised on a range of issues, including peace negotiations in Europe, scientific and environmental agreements, and initiatives to investigate and prosecute persons responsible for war crimes.

In addition, Mr. O'Brien has negotiated agreements protecting intellectual property rights for scientific cooperation with China, promoted environmentally sound international trade regulations for hazardous and recyclable materials, and worked to make public-private partnerships and corporate social responsibility an important element in American foreign policy. As the first Presidential Envoy for Hostage Affairs, he helped establish the office and worked for the safe return of 100 American citizens.

I have no doubt that he will bring the same dedication and rigor to advancing and coordinating U.S. sanctions policy as he has his prior roles.

I strongly support confirming Mr. O'Brien. His confirmation will be critical to enhancing our sanctions efforts at this critical time. I urge my colleagues to join me in supporting his

nomination, along with all of the foreign affairs nominations pending before this body, to advance our national security interests and improve our representation abroad.

EXECUTIVE CALENDAR

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Under the previous order, the Senate will proceed to the consideration of the O'Brien nomination, which the clerk will report.

The bill clerk read the nomination of James C. O'Brien, of Nebraska, to be Head of the Office of Sanctions Coordination, with the rank of Ambassador. (New Position)

VOTE ON O'BRIEN NOMINATION

The PRESIDING OFFICER. The question is, Will the Senate advise and consent to the O'Brien nomination?

Mr. WHITEHOUSE. Madam President, I ask for the yeas and nays.

The PRESIDING OFFICER. Is there a sufficient second?

There appears to be a sufficient second.

The clerk will call the roll.

The bill clerk called the roll.

Mr. DURBIN. I announce that the Senator from Delaware (Mr. COONS) and the Senator from New Jersey (Mr. MENENDEZ) are necessarily absent.

Mr. THUNE. The following Senator is necessarily absent: the Senator from Nebraska (Mr. SASSE).

The result was announced—yeas 71, nays 26, as follows:

[Rollcall Vote No. 130 Ex.]

YEAS—71

Baldwin	Heinrich	Romney
Barrasso	Hickenlooper	Rosen
Bennet	Hirono	Rounds
Blumenthal	Hoeven	Sanders
Blunt	Kaine	Schatz
Booker	Kelly	Schumer
Brown	King	Shaheen
Burr	Klobuchar	Sinema
Cantwell	Leahy	Smith
Capito	Lujan	Stabenow
Cardin	Manchin	Sullivan
Carper	Markey	Tester
Casey	McConnell	Thune
Collins	Merkley	Tillis
Cornyn	Murkowski	Toomey
Cortez Masto	Murphy	Van Hollen
Crapo	Murray	Warner
Duckworth	Ossoff	Warnock
Durbin	Padilla	Warren
Feinstein	Paul	Whitehouse
Gillibrand	Peters	Wicker
Graham	Portman	Wyden
Grassley	Reed	Young
Hassan	Risch	

NAYS—26

Blackburn	Fischer	Lummis
Boozman	Hagerty	Marshall
Braun	Hawley	Moran
Cassidy	Hyde-Smith	Rubio
Cotton	Inhofe	Scott (FL)
Cramer	Johnson	Scott (SC)
Cruz	Kennedy	Shelby
Daines	Lankford	Tuberville
Ernst	Lee	

NOT VOTING—3

Coons	Menendez	Sasse
-------	----------	-------

The nomination was confirmed.

The PRESIDING OFFICER (Mr. HICKENLOOPER). Under the previous order, the motion to reconsider is considered made and laid upon the table, and the President will be immediately notified of the Senate's action.